

### **REMARKS**

Applicant appreciate the Examiner's allowance of Claims 3, 4, 7-18, 20-21, 23-24, 26-27 and 33-54.

Applicant will now address the Examiner's remaining objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

#### **Claim Objection**

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to Claim 25 for an informality therein in the recital of the claim number. Applicant has now amended the claim to correct this informality and respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112**

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 22 and 25 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as being based on an alleged non-enabling disclosure and rejects Claims 1, 2, 5-6, and 22-25 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In particular, the Examiner seems to have objections to the terms "a first wiring" and "a second wiring" in the claims. While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended the claims to change "first wiring" to "power source line" and "second wiring" to "discharge line," respectively. This is clearly supported by the specification and drawings of the present application, such as for example Fig. 1B and in the already allowed claims ("pixel electrode" in Claims 1 and 2 has been changed to "anode" in order to avoid duplication of claims).

The Examiner also rejects Claims 19 and 28-32 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is also respectfully traversed. However, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, the objected to language has been replaced with the recital that the phosphorescence is generated from a triplet excitation.

Accordingly, for at least the above-stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the §112 rejections have been overcome, and it is requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

#### Claims Rejections - 35 USC §102

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1, 5 and 6 under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Nishigaki. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments made above to change “first wiring” to “power source line” and “second wiring” to “discharge line,” respectively, distinguish the claimed invention over Nishigaki (as evidenced by the claims already allowed). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Conclusion

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any additional fee is due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark J. Murphy', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.  
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 000026568